

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bec 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/010,079	ı	1/09/2001	Peter V. Schwartz	SCH WPE.004A	SCH WPE.004A 2692	
20995	7590	06/30/2004		EXAMINER		
		S OLSON & BEA	KACKAR, RAM N			
2040 MAIN FOURTEEN		R		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA	A 92614			1763		

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		Annilastian Na	A == 1: -= == 4(=)	<u> </u>				
	,	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
0.65		10/010,079	SCHWARTZ, PETER V					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Ram N Kackar	1763					
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication aport or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address					
THE - Extrafte - If th - If N - Fail	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the provision of the provisions	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a eply within the statutory minimum of thi d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ate, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communic  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.				
Status								
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09	November 2001.		•				
2a)□	•	nis action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	tion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>13-21</u> is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.						
Applicat	tion Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	ccepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeya action is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	• •				
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152					
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document None of:  2. Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document None Certified Copies Of the Priority None Certified Cert	nts have been received.  Ints have been received in A  Iority documents have beer  au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No  received in this National Stage					
Attachmer		A) [] 1-42	Europe (PTO 442)	,				
2) 🔲 Notio 3) 🔯 Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/5/2004</u> .	Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) ·					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-12 drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 118, subclass 725.
  - II. Claims 13-21 drawn to a method, classified in class 427, subclass 585.
- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as etching.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with Nancy Vensko on 2/13/04 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-12. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 13-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
- 5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 1763

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 7. Claims 1-2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maejima et al (JP 60119727).

Maejima et al disclose a conductive heater block (Abstract and Fig 2-7) and a conductive heater positioned in a cylindrical cavity (8), of the heater block.

8. Claims 1-2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Futaki et al (JP 09001610).

Futaki et al disclose a conductive heater block (Fig 1) and a conductive heater positioned in a cylindrical cavity (3), of the heater block.

9. Claims 1-2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hall et al (US 3514575).

Art Unit: 1763

Hall et al disclose a conductive heater block (Fig 1) and a conductive heater positioned in a cylindrical cavity (5), of the heater block.

10. Claims 1, 3-5, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Futakuchiya et al (US 6180931).

Futakuchiya et al disclose a conductive heater block of copper, copper alloy, aluminum or steel (Fig 1-7, Col 1 lines 13-21, Col 3 lines 55-67), a conductive heater positioned in a cylindrical cavity (Fig 1-2a, 4; Fig 5-7 12), of the heater block and full cut extending to cavity configured to heat susceptor and electrostatic chuck (Col 1 lines 13-20).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Futakuchiya et al (US 6180931).

Futakuchiya et al disclose a conductive heater block, a conductive heater positioned in a cylindrical cavity of the heater block configured to heat susceptor and electrostatic chuck (Col 1 lines 13-20).

Futakuchiya et al do not clearly disclose that the support surface of the susceptor, which is disclosed to house the heater, is of one-piece construction.

However, making elements integral was held to have been obvious. *Nerwin v. Erlichman* 168 USPQ 177 (PO BdPatApp 1969); *In re Wolfe* 116 USPQ 443 (CCPA 1958); *In re Howard* 150 US 164 (USSC 1893). Similarly, making elements separable was held to have been obvious. *In re Dulberg* 129 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1961).

Art Unit: 1763

12. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Futakuchiya et al (US 6180931) in view of Shih-Tsung Liang (US 5934947) and Petreto (US 5938663).

Futakuchiya et al disclose a conductive heater block of copper, copper alloy, aluminum or steel (Fig 1-7, Col 1 lines 13-21, Col 3 lines 55-67), a conductive heater positioned in a cylindrical cavity (Fig 1-2a, 4; Fig 5-7 12), of the heater block and full cut extending to cavity configured to heat susceptor and electrostatic chuck (Col 1 lines 13-20).

Futakuchiya et al disclose the need for good bonding but do not disclose a partial cut to provide flexibility to the heater block for good contact for efficient heat transfer.

Shih-Tsung Liang discloses a structure to provide good contact of a clamp on a cylindrical post by using a through cut upto the cavity which contains the post as in a battery connector (Fig 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a structure taught by Shih-Tsung Liang to apply to the heater block of Futakuchiya et al where a single heater would be needed in order to provide good contact for efficient heat transfer.

Shih-Tsung Liang however does not disclose partial cut to provide flexibility for bending the clamp like structure.

Petreto discloses that a partial cut (Fig 6-30) and a straight through cut 25 provide flexibility to the ring 24. Obviously flexibility lets the clamp conform to the shape of the cylindrical body.

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a structure taught by Shih-Tsung Liang as modified by Petreto to apply to the

Art Unit: 1763

heater block of Futakuchiya et al where a single heater would be needed in order to provide efficient heat transfer.

Regarding the limitation of yield strength, since the materials for the heater block of Futakuchiya et al are same as claimed, it is obvious that the yield strength would also be same. Yield strength of steel is known to be more than 200 Mpa.

Regarding the thickness of material left by the partial cut, it would be obvious that too much removal of material would leave it week and reduce its life over several times of opening and closing for maintenance.

13. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Futakuchiya et al (US 6180931) in view of Merrit et al (US 4510377).

Futakuchiya et al disclose a conductive heater block of copper, copper alloy, aluminum or steel (Fig 1-7, Col 1 lines 13-21, Col 3 lines 55-67), a conductive heater positioned in a cylindrical cavity (Fig 1-2a, 4; Fig 5-7 12), of the heater block and full cut extending to cavity configured to heat susceptor and electrostatic chuck (Col 1 lines 13-20).

Futakuchiya et al do not disclose the detailed structure of the conductor heater, especially that the inner conductor is wound over an insulator.

Merrit et al disclose a cartridge heater with an inner conductor over a ceramic insulator embedded under another ceramic split ring and enclosed in a metal housing (Abstract and Fig 1-2).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have ceramic on both sides of the resistance heating wire to have electrical insulation and have conductive sheath of metal for good heat transfer and mechanical strength.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on 571 272 1439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RK

P. Hassanzadek primary Examiner AV 1763